

dictators into the United States, in contradiction to the anticorruption principles articulated by the President in August, the administration announces to the world that we will compromise our principles for a price: oil.

On April 12 of this year, at the State Department, Secretary Rice greeted the President of Equatorial Guinea, Teodoro Obiang, by saying: "Thank you very much for your presence here. You are a good friend and we welcome you." In welcoming Mr. Obiang, she made no mention of the deeply troubling hallmarks of his regime, no mention of human rights abuses, no mention of election fraud; no mention of widespread and high-level corruption. Instead, a photograph of Secretary Rice shaking Mr. Obiang's hand and smiling broadly appeared in publications around the world. Mr. Obiang has undoubtedly used his visit, and that photograph, to legitimize his regime and demonstrate his favored status in the United States.

Secretary Rice said that her objective as Secretary of State is to conduct "transformational diplomacy" which, in her words, requires us to "work with our many partners around the world to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people—and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system." Under Mr. Obiang, Equatorial Guinea is nothing near democratic, well-governed, or responsive to its citizens.

Equatorial Guinea is the third largest oil producer in sub-Saharan Africa. It currently exports about 360,000 barrels per day, with much more under development. U.S. companies have invested over \$10 billion to develop those oil resources. But the development of Equatorial Guinea's oil resources has not benefitted its deeply impoverished people. Though Equatorial Guinea's oil money makes it, on a per capita basis, one of the wealthiest nations in the world, the standard of living of its people is among the world's poorest. Equatorial Guinea ranks 121st on the United Nations Human Development Index. According to a 2002 State Department report, there is "little evidence that the country's oil wealth is being devoted to the public good."

Mr. Obiang is a principal cause of his people's misery. He took power by coup 30 years ago, his opponents have been jailed and tortured, and his most recent election was condemned by the State Department as "marred by extensive fraud and intimidation." The 2005 State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices states, that in Equatorial Guinea, "Official corruption in all branches of the government remained a significant problem." In its index of corruption, Transparency International ranks Equatorial Guinea 152 out of 159 nations. In other words, Equatorial Guinea is one of the most corrupt countries in the world today.

I became familiar with the Obiang regime through my role as ranking mi-

nority member of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. On July 15, 2004, the subcommittee held a hearing entitled, "Money Laundering and Foreign Corruption: Enforcement and Effectiveness of the Patriot Act." That hearing and an accompanying report detailed how President Obiang and his family had been personally profiting from U.S. oil companies operating in his country, established offshore shell corporations to open bank accounts at Riggs Bank here in Washington, and made large deposits, including cash deposits of as much as \$3 million at a time, in transactions suggesting strongly that the funds were the proceeds of foreign corruption. In addition, over \$35 million in oil proceeds were transferred to suspect offshore accounts.

President Bush has stated that his intention is to "defeat high-level public corruption in all its forms and to deny corrupt officials access to the international financial system as a means of defrauding their people and hiding their ill-gotten gains." And yet, after it was revealed that Mr. Obiang misused U.S. financial institutions to launder suspect funds, the State Department actually intervened on behalf of his regime in order to convince U.S. banks to open accounts for the Equatorial Guinean Government. That bears repeating: after it was shown how Mr. Obiang used Riggs Bank to deposit and transfer suspect funds, and after Riggs shut down the accounts used by him and his regime, the State Department approached reluctant U.S. banks and asked them to open accounts for the Obiang regime. So much for "denying corrupt officials access to our financial system."

There is more. A few months ago, in May, the administration announced a new program directing the Defense Department to help 20 specified countries build up their military forces. One was Equatorial Guinea. Despite a terrible human rights record, a reputation for corruption, and their own oil wealth, the administration proposed spending U.S. taxpayer dollars to build up the Obiang regime's military. Indeed, President Bush asked for a provision in the DOD authorization bill approving the funding. A number of us objected, and Equatorial Guinea was removed from the provision in the Senate bill.

These and other actions taken by the administration to court Mr. Obiang are more than misguided. They supply ammunition to critics of America who claim we don't mean what we say and we don't live up to our principles, especially when oil is at stake. On the issue of foreign corruption, the President needs to play it straight. What will it be? Will we avert our eyes from Mr. Obiang's record of corruption and brutality so we can obtain Equatorial Guinea's oil? Or will we demand an end to his corrupt ways?

The President's courting of Mr. Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan is also disturbing. Mr. Nazarbayev is an iron-

fisted dictator who imprisons his opponents, bans opposition parties, and controls the press. The State Department's 2005 Kazakhstan Country Report on Human Rights Practices states that "the government's human rights record remained poor," and "corruption remained a serious problem."

That is not all. Several years ago, our Justice Department filed a criminal indictment alleging that Mr. Nazarbayev accepted tens of millions of dollars in bribes from an American businessman. The U.S. attorney of the Southern District of New York is at this very moment preparing for trial in the case, U.S. v. Giffen. The indictment targets the American businessman, James Giffen, for paying \$78 million in bribes to Mr. Nazarbayev and his cronies to gain access to an oil field in Kazakhstan. It does not charge Mr. Nazarbayev with a crime, despite alleging his acceptance of the bribes. It is a sad and sorry spectacle to observe that, despite this indictment, the administration is welcoming Mr. Nazarbayev to the White House this week.

Talk about mixed messages. For paying the bribes, Mr. Giffen gets indicted for violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, mail and wire fraud, money laundering, and tax evasion; for accepting the bribes, Mr. Nazarbayev gets an invitation to the White House. The President has invited to the White House a man who our very own Department of Justice accuses of accepting a \$78 million bribe. Why? What could be the reason, the justification, for this White House invitation? Could it be that Kazakhstan exports 1 million barrels of oil per day?

The President has got to play it straight. The State Department says Mr. Nazarbayev is a dictator who imprisons opponents and disregards human rights. The Justice Department says he accepted \$78 million in bribes from one U.S. businessman alone. The President says he is an honored guest. Which is it? Corrupt dictator or honored guest? Surely it can't be both.

President Bush said that kleptocracy "threatens our national interest and violates our values." He said high-level foreign corruption "impedes our efforts to promote freedom and democracy, end poverty, and combat international crime and terrorism." He is right, which is exactly why his courtship of corrupt dictators like Mr. Obiang and Mr. Nazarbayev is so deeply regrettable. To compromise our battle against corruption to gain favor with oil-producing dictators is not only morally wrong, it hands a propaganda club to our critics, it sustains brutal and corrupt regimes, and it is ultimately destructive of our efforts, in the words of Secretary Rice, to "build and sustain democratic, well-governed states."

AGRICULTURE NATURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to an issue that is vital

to agricultural producers in my State as well as across our Nation. That issue is agriculture natural disaster assistance. The relentless drought has brought economic hardship to both our agriculture producers and our rural communities. Farmers and ranchers in many different parts of the United States are suffering the effects of natural disasters.

We must not and cannot continue to ignore the impacts of drought and the effect it has on our agricultural producers and our rural communities. Agricultural producers are every bit as deserving of assistance for their suffering from the drought as the small businesses suffering from the hurricanes.

We as a nation have a responsibility to provide emergency assistance to those who have had losses due to natural disasters. I look forward to working with my colleagues to fulfill that responsibility, working to support a bill that provides critical emergency relief to our Nation's agricultural producers. After what I hope will be a healthy debate on this important issue, I ask that a vote be taken on the bill.

Too often, the argument is made that farmers and ranchers should be satisfied with the funding they will receive from the farm bill. The truth is that only 18 percent of the total funding in the farm bill goes directly to producers. The rest goes to very important programs, such as Food Stamps and the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program. Nothing in the farm bill was ever intended to cover losses due to natural disasters. It is only intended to cover economic losses.

The same way we use emergency funds to help individuals and rebuild communities hurt by hurricanes and tornadoes, we should use emergency funds to help individuals and rebuild our communities hurt by drought.

WAR ON TERROR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak for a few minutes in morning business.

In August, I received a letter from a constituent, Mr. John Dodgen, of Humboldt, IA. Along with the letter, Mr. Dodgen enclosed a copy of an opinion piece he authored regarding the war on terror that was published in the local newspaper.

In his opinion piece, Mr. Dodgen rightly asserts that the United States is engaged in a global war on terror with an enemy whose goal is the elimination of the United States. I also strongly agree with his premise that we must take the fight to the terrorists where they operate or we will be forced to confront them on our soil. This is a war that we must win, and we must remain on the offense until the war is won.

Mr. Dodgen raises some compelling thoughts in his opinion piece. Rather than try to summarize all of Mr. Dodgen's points and recommendations,

I would like to submit for the RECORD his thoughts on controlling terrorism.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Dodgen's opinion piece be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLLING TERRORISM

Our world is made-up of two dramatically opposed factions. Those who enjoy freedom versus those who would enslave the world. This is not a debatable subject—it's an all out world war of ideologies.

As a nation of freedom, we are engaged in a conflict that must be won or our world culture will be reduced to the dark ages. We are engaged in a conflict for survival.

The nations of Iran, Syria, North Korea, and the terrorists of Hezbollah all seek one objective—the destruction of Israel and the United States. They are like "mad dogs". There is no way to reason with them to a peace loving state. The only solution with a rabies infected dog is to destroy it. This same strategy does not apply to all Muslims, only those lunatic, malicious, hateful, and destruction-minded fanatics who declared war on "infidels" several years ago. In World War II the allies stopped Hitler, Mussolini and Japan from destroying half the world. Ninety percent of my Navy amphibious group were killed or wounded invading the Philippines and millions of others were killed in tragic World War II.

While we still have a chance to stamp out the hate and suicidal destructive force in our world, the U.S. and our allies should confront Iran, Syria, North Korea, and Hezbollah with an ultimatum to destroy their rockets and nuclear warhead pursuits or we will have no alternative but to destroy them ourselves with or without the United Nations blessing. It's totally unrealistic to think that negotiations with these evil nations will solve or alleviate the threat, so we should bring this to a head before they attack any other nations and unleash their evil hatred and destruction on innocent, peace-loving people. We should use every means within our power to reduce their threat to insignificance. There is no other course; we should act now while our declared and profound enemies are vulnerable to our containment. If we wait and try to solve our world's conflict with diplomacy and negotiation, we are fooling ourselves and eventually our nation and our love for freedom and peaceful existence on Earth will be destroyed.

In past history, two postures for our nation—The Monroe Doctrine and Teddy Roosevelt's "Walk Softly And Carry A Big Stick Policy"—along with President Kennedy's demand that Russia withdraw rockets with nuclear warheads from Cuba, kept us from wars to maintain our freedom. Now we need to declare and carry out the United States world position that we will not tolerate "evil and war mongering" nations, and unless they cease and desist of such a threat they will have the United States and its overwhelming power to force them to do so. We were able to convince Libya to stop its terrorism with a well placed bomb; we can do the same with the other terrorist nations listed.

America needs to withdraw from the United Nations as they have utterly failed from their beginning existence to keep the peace or more than temporarily stop aggression and human suffering. What the world needs is for the United States to establish a "World Peace Council" made up of: The President of the United States; The Prime Minister of England; Queen Elizabeth and/or Australia's Governor General; The President

and/or The Prime Minister of Russia; The President of China; The Emperor and/or Prime Minister of Japan; The President of India.

These nations could meet for three days every month to determine the issues requiring their attention, determine the appropriate action, and then enforce their decision based on the majority vote of the council. A veto would be prohibited. Funding would be on an assessed basis from the seven nations plus other voluntary freedom loving nations and a chosen General whose International Police Force would be enlisted on a country by country basis to carry out the seven nations' solution.

If any of the nations selected to form the World Peace Council chooses not to serve or withdraws, then the remaining members would select a nation for their replacement. In the case of a tie vote, another candidate would be chosen until a majority vote determined the successor.

As a Christian, it is utterly deplorable for me to come to the above conclusion. However; as a practical human being and a concerned U.S. Citizen, I acknowledge that terrorism is a fact that must be recognized and dealt with. I therefore urge our Congress and President to declare an ultimatum on the nations of terrorists and restrain them while we still have the power and resolve to do so. We cannot wait until we have another Pearl Harbor, Cuban Missile Crisis, or 9/11 before we stop this aggression.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN MEMORY OF SEYMOUR ROBINSON

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to pay tribute to an exceptional man and a wonderful friend of mine, Seymour Robinson. Seymour died on September 13 at the age of 90. His deep sense of moral and social responsibility and tireless commitment to giving back touched the lives of all who knew him.

Seymour was born on May 24, 1916, in Chicago, IL. He worked hard to support his family during the Great Depression. He enlisted in the Army Air Corps and was soon transferred to the U.S. Army Infantry in Fort Worth, TX. It was here that he met his beloved wife of 60 years, Anita. Before they could marry, he was shipped out to serve in World War II.

As a member of the Civil Affairs D Team of the U.S. First Infantry Division, he fought at Omaha Beach during the U.S. landing in Normandy on D-Day. As part of a U.S. unit attached to the French Second Armored Division, Seymour was involved in the liberation of Paris. After his unit captured the German SS barracks on the Place de la Republique in Paris, it was overrun by cheering crowds; the Jewish people in Paris were finally able to come out of hiding, wearing the yellow stars that were used to segregate them. Of this time, Seymour recounts a powerful incident: "As their enthusiasm settled down, we were asked a devastating question: 'What is the will of the Americans. Are we still to wear our yellow stars?' Without a second's hesitation, we tore the stars off the clothes of